

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/077,157	0	2/15/2002	Fumihiko Kimura	JP20000002US1 1271	
23550	7590	10/18/2005		EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN 75 STATE S		CK & D'ALESSA	RAO, SHEELA S		
14TH FL ALBANY, NY 12207				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2125	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/077,157	KIMURA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sheela Rao	2125
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 At</u> This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,9,13 and 14 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,9,13 and 14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 March 2002 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a) accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	`	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	

Applicant's Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on August 9, 2005 is acknowledged 1.

and has been made of record.

Art Unit: 2125

2. The amendment submitted after the Final rejection has been entered and considered.

3. Claims 1-4, 9, and 13-14 are pending and presented for examination. Claims 5-8, 10-12, and 15-

20 have been cancelled.

Response to Amendment

4. The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 USC §102(e) over Harrison et al. (USPN 6,611,725) is

maintained. The rejection is restated below as it pertains to currently pending claims 1-4, 9, and 13-14.

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior

Office action.

Claims 1-4, 9, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harrison, et 6.

al. (USPN 6,611,725 B1).

The patented invention by Harrison, et al. (hereinafter, "Harrison") teaches of a "computer-

implemented method and apparatus for processing a design model generated by a CAD system." In

doing so, the reference discloses the use of a "generation means" which accesses stored data that details

construction design and then processes the data to generate images and tags to associate the images

with the model component. A drawing document or vector drawing data is also made which constitutes

geometric data of the model and has tag data associated with the image. See column 2: lines 30, et seq.;

Figures 1, 2A and 2B.

The computerized modeling system used by the patented invention comprises a CPU, a display

device, and a storage device among other components. CAD software is used to execute the software

applications of the apparatus. The software is stored within the system's storage device and allows the

user to create and modify models to produce drawings and data. The display device is used to show graphical representations of the modeling design. See column 4: lines 35, et seq.; column 6: lines 47-53.

The drawing documents that are created from the three-dimensional models can be enhanced through the use of annotations added by the user using the computer based annotation tools. The association of the annotated data and the image elements provides linkage to components of the design model to better assist in designing and maintaining part information. For the reasons stated above, the limitations of the claimed invention is taught by the prior arts of record; thereby, rendering the instant claims unpatentable.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed May 16, 2005 and again with the RCE on August 9, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant begins by arguing that the reference of prior art to Harrison fails to teach or suggest "the generation of bi-directional relationship information representing a correlation between design information used for a design operation, and geometry data that is obtained by the design operation." This issue has been clarified in the previous Office action. Wherein the relation between variables or data or information is stated as being inherent in a database since the art of searching databases can be executed in either direction. It is further stated that in the generation of data between design information and geometry data, a bi-directional relationship between the two types can easily be established since a correlation between the two forms of data exists.

Next, arguments regarding claims 1, 9, and 13 are stated. The presence of a "display means for employing said reference relationship information stored in said storage means to display linking information indicating that a reference relationship is established ..." and "means for obtaining said design information from said geometry data and for obtaining said geometry data from said design information, using said linking information" is not found in the patented invention by Harrison is stated. Examiner disagrees. In column 5, beginning at line 47, with reference to Figure 2, Harrison explains the use of a display means for showing the model with reference information as established between design and

Application/Control Number: 10/077,157

Art Unit: 2125

geometry data. With regard to the obtaining of design information from geometry data and vice versa using linking information. Harrison teaches this aspect of the instant invention at column 3, line 3 et seq. and at column 4, line 37, et seq. The reference explains how the annotations or tag data for the design information are accomplished by the CAD system where the designs are associated with tag data.

Finally, arguments pertaining to claim 14 are made. Wherein it is stated that the reference to Harrison does not teach or suggest "multiple digital documents are present as the reference target, said reference target display means enables the computer to display a list of said multiple digital documents ...". Harrison uses the creation of a bolt assembly as an example in explaining the functionality of the patented invention. The presence of various documents and the CAD storing relationship data, so as to form a reference database is explained.

The limitation of the instant invention as per claims 1-4, 9, and 13-14 are taught and/or suggested by the reference of prior art to Harrison et al. For the reasons stated above, the claims remain rejected under 35 USC §102(e).

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheela Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3751. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached on (571) 272-3749. The fax number for the organization where this application or any proceeding papers is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application
Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from
either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. It should be noted that status information for unpublished
applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

<u>http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</u>. Should any questions arise regarding access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sheela S. Rao October 4, 2005

LEO PICARD SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100